

Proposal Reviews

#204: Integrated Assessment of Delta Smelt Condition Factors for Determining Contaminant and Food Web Effects on Population Dynamics

University of California, Davis

Initial Selection Panel Review

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review

Bay Regional Review

Delta Regional Review

San Joaquin Regional Review

Sacramento Regional Review

External Scientific Review

#1

#2

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 204

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis

Proposal Title: Integrated Assessment of Delta Smelt Condition Factors for Determining Contaminant and Food Web Effects on Population Dynamics

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)

Not Recommended (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

Fund	
As Is	-
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	X

Amount: **\$0**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

This proposal contains several different components which would be linked to an overall population model. Linkages and overall goal of the research proposal are not clearly stated. All panels recognized that the basic information derived from this research would unquestionably be valuable. The selection panel believes the applicants effort to understand population dynamics of delta smelt will benefit from the upcoming CALFED-sponsored delta smelt workshop. The outcome of that workshop should help refine, focus, and prioritize research efforts for this species; this group should take advantage of that to develop a more coherent proposal.

Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review Form

Proposal Number: 204

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis

Proposal Title: Integrated Assessment of Delta Smelt Condition Factors for Determining Contaminant and Food Web Effects on Population Dynamics

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	This proposal addresses a topic of high relevance to CalFed goals. If successful it could generate some useful information for understanding delta smelt biology. Unfortunately, the panel felt it wont generate an understanding of the population biology. The regional reviewers rated this project as a mixture of medium and high priority. The review panel felt that the difficulty of interpreting the bioindicators in a population sense, weaknesses in the experimental design of field experiments and the likelihood of ambiguous results from some of the biomarker and parasite analysis will limit interpretation of the data. The panel also felt that this team needs to demonstrate that the array of factors they propose to focus upon are actually the critical elements for understanding delta smelt population biology. The proposal ignores the possibility that introductions of exotics or base changes in system productivity could be responsible for some or all the apparent changes in delta smelt abundance. The proposal ranked as adequate.
-Above average	
XAdequate	
-Not recommended	

1. **Goals and Justification.** Does the proposal present a clear statement of goals, objectives and hypotheses? Does the proposal present a clear justification and conceptual model for the project?

The consensus of reviewers was that the goals and objectives were not as clearly stated as they could have been. The principal goal is to understand the factors (natural and anthropogenic) involved in determining success of delta smelt at the population level. They hope to meet their goals by addressing a number of issues that they hypothesize could contribute to poor population performance in the Delta smelt.

2. **Likelihood of Success (Approach, Feasibility, Capabilities and Performance Measures).** Is the project likely to succeed based on the approach, feasibility and project team capabilities? Are the proposed performance measures adequate for measuring the project's success?

The consensus among regional and external reviewers is that the project team is capable and qualified to conduct this research project as proposed. For this and most of the other research proposals the performance measures and the products are the same and do not necessarily serve as performance measures. There is a low probability that this investigation will provide a better basis for understanding the factors (natural and anthropogenic) involved in determining success of delta smelt at the population level. The consensus among reviewers was that learning more about the array of environmental factors that could be affecting delta smelt (at the population level) needs further investigation. There were some concerns raised about their shotgun approach. The panel felt that this would make interpreting results and integrating the diverse components of this research difficult. There were also concerns about the fact that the major factors affecting smelt population might not be addressed by this project.

3. **Outcomes and Products.** Will the project advance the state of scientific knowledge in general and/or make an important contribution to the state of knowledge of the Bay-Delta Watershed? For restoration proposals, is the project likely to contribute to ecosystem restoration or species recoveries in a significant way? Will the project produce products useful to decision-makers and scientists?

The project proposes to advance the state of knowledge with regard to factors that could be limiting the population success of Delta smelt. This project may provide needed information to serve as a basis for developing a strategy to improve conditions for Delta smelt within its habitat. One reviewer felt that the field-tethered bioassays would be of little value in truly understanding how contaminants affect them or what limits Delta smelt.

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

There were no significant budget issues raised with regard to accuracy. Although a large budget, it may be reasonable for a multi-investigator effort. Benefits to recovering delta smelt populations will depend on likelihood of meeting all the objectives which the panel judged low.

5. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

There was moderately strong support for this research as a high priority for ERP among the various regional panels (2H, 2 M priority). It was generally felt that the project could add to base of knowledge of delta smelt, but that details were lacking on how all the detailed environmental factors would be studied. The regional reviewers noted that a strength of this project is that it offers to be used as a means of evaluating the Environmental Water Account. While it cannot serve to evaluate the EWA for all species it can address one that is a target of EWA management practices. However, details of the evaluation were omitted. It was noted that it wasn't clear in the proposal exactly how they intend to use the project to evaluate EWA actions. Lack of local involvement was cited by some of the regional reviewers. The panel was less concerned about this for the smelt because it is likely to prove to be difficult to get public involvement for a species that isn't a gamefish.

6. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

No significant administrative issues were raised.

Miscellaneous comments:

None

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 204

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis

Proposal Title: Integrated Assessment of Delta Smelt Condition Factors for Determining Contaminant and Food Web Effects on Population Dynamics

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

The panel supports this research because it delivers scientific information which improves understanding about key ecosystem processes in the Bay + Suisun Marsh or about species and habitats which are insufficiently understood.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

Well qualified team.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

Yes, mechanisms behind Delta Smelt population dynamics are very important (MR-6: ensure recovery of at-risk species by developing conceptual understanding + models that cross regions).

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

Strong linkages to UCD programs on DS and to CVPIA goals.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

Actually, this proposal really needs to work on connectivity to local groups and decision-makers. Products (info/models) should have broader outlets than just sci conferences or papers. Water mgmt decison based on DS issue impact a huge constituency.

Other Comments:

.

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 204

Proposal Title: Integrated Assessment of Delta Smelt Condition Factors for Determining Contaminant and Food Web Effects on Population Dynamics

Overall Ranking: -Low ☒Medium -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

The uncertainties about the EWA section of this study, and questions about the usefulness of this information kept this proposal from being scored a high.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

☒Yes -No

How?

Bennett and Kimmerer have been thoroughly involved with the IEP and CALFED process for a number of years and have produced. All participants are experts within their fields and have significant publication records. Delta smelt will be collected from IEP monitoring activities thus permits are taken care of as long as IEP doesn't change their mind. No letter of commitment attached indicating IEPs support.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

☒Yes -No

How?

Ecosystem Restoration Program Strategic Goals Further understanding of food web and population dynamics as well as the protection of fish using the Environmental Water Account will address Goal 1 at-risk-species.

Regional Implementation Priorities Multi-region. Furthering our understanding of the population effects of toxins will address MR-5 (ensuring restoration is not threatened by poor water quality). Additional model development helps achieve MR-6(ensure at-risk species' recovery by developing conceptual understanding + models that cross regions).

Regional Implementation Priorities Delta and Bay Regions. Additional understanding of models and food web dynamics as well as contaminants will produce information for DR-4, DR-6, DR-7, BA-5, and BA-7.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

☒Yes -No

How?

Though this is not a request for next-phase funding, it does build on previous CALFED funded projects and not a duplication of effort. This is an important step in determining the population impacts and dynamics of delta smelt. The impacts of smelt take relative to EWA actions is also a huge gap. This work could significantly help with management actions associated with the EWA.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

This study works closely with the Delta Smelt Culturing facility at UC Davis, other CALFED projects direct by CALFED, IEP, and the Western Center for Estuarine Ecosystem Indicator Research at Bodega Bay. Wim is also involved with the CALFED science program.

Other Comments:

EWA portion almost appears as an afterthought title doesnt reflect all the work in the proposal but it is a good idea.

What exactly is Wim going to produce for the EWA thing? This wasnt articulated very well.

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 204

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis

Proposal Title: Integrated Assessment of Delta Smelt Condition Factors for Determining Contaminant and Food Web Effects on Population Dynamics

Overall Ranking: -Low **XMedium** -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

The committee ranked this project as a medium priority for the San Joaquin region. The proposal would have been stronger if it had more applicability to the priorities of the region and involved more local groups in its implementation.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

Project piggybacks on an ongoing IEP monitoring project that already has the necessary permits (sect 7 &10) to take smelt in the delta. No acquisition of land or need for easements required for project. No capital expenditure for vessels. Faculty of UC Davis well versed in the scientific techniques and protocols necessary for proposal. However, only portions of the Mokelumne River and south delta have smelt that could be considered to be in the San Joaquin region, thus most of the region is not involved. Not applicable regionally.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

Proposal addresses CALFED Strategic goals #'s 1,2,5, and 6 (at-risk species, Ecological processes, non-native species, and water quality and sediment quality), Multi-regional #'s 5 and 6 (restoration not compromised by degraded water quality, at-risk species), Sacramento River #7 (develop conceptual models to support restoration), Delta #4 6 and 7 (restore habitat for at-risk species, restore shallow water habitat for at-risk species while minimizing effects of contaminants, protect at-risk species through water management) and Bay #5 (restore shallow water habitat for at-risk species).

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

-Yes **XNo**

How?

Builds on a '97 PSP project by the applicant. Links with UCD delta smelt culturing facility and UC Davis faculty and staff. Project has strong ties to the delta and north delta through ties with the university but has no substantial ties to the San Joaquin region.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

-Yes ☒No

How?

Project involves staff and faculty from UC Davis and personnel from IEP and Delta CDFG offices but no real involvement of local people or institutions from the San Joaquin region.

Other Comments:

N/A

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 204

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis

Proposal Title: Integrated Assessment of Delta Smelt Condition Factors for Determining Contaminant and Food Web Effects on Population Dynamics

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

Although delta smelt distribution extends only partially into the panel's region, delta smelt remain one of the primary species regulating water use in the tributaries. This project would provide critical information needed to evaluate the potential benefits of different restoration actions.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

This project is an extension of an previously funded CALFED project on delta smelt. The team has access to fish needed for the study and the necessary facilities for analyses.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

Delta smelt are a priority "at risk" species for the region.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

An especially attractive feature of this project is that it will be used for the evaluation of the Environmental Water Account, one of CALFED's major activities in the Delta. This type of detailed evaluation is desperately needed.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

This project is closely linked with EWA, which has broad participation from government agencies, resource managers, environmental groups and water users.

Other Comments:

The applicants have a superior track record. The team especially like the use of integrated methods to address the various research questions. However, we recommend that CALFED determine whether the USGS contaminant monitoring task may already be funded by IEP.

External Scientific: #1

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **204**

Applicant Organization: **University of California, Davis**

Proposal Title: **Integrated Assessment of Delta Smelt Condition Factors for Determining Contaminant and Food Web Effects on Population Dynamics**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

none

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	Good plus-proposal subject has merit and interest to CALFED goals. The proposal could have been written and organized better. A lot of scientific jargon made for difficult reading.
XGood	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

The goals are stated but could perhaps be better stated. This proposal is about understanding the factors (natural and anthropogenic) involved in determining success of delta smelt at the population level. The hypotheses are overdone and difficult to read and easily understand.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

A conceptual model is outlined in the text. It could be better stated (simpler) but gets the job done. The selection of a research project addressing issues related to recruitment seems justified at this stage of understanding for Delta smelt. More information on factors affecting delta smelt are definitely needed.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

Much of the approach would appear to be straightforward. If successful the project could provide some important information on how to manage the system to improve conditions for Delta Smelt. Some important technical details were left out. For example, where will the juvenile smelt come from for the bioassays, how they will they be handled, who will care for them. The proposers point out more than once in the proposal how delicate and difficult to handle delta smelt can be. These seem to be important details. They also say that wild collected fish will be sampled for blood prior to stress effects from handling. How have they or will they evaluated this? It seems that spending 10-20 minute in a trawl could induce significant stress. How do they know that this will not interfere with stress indicators they plan to measure? I dont like the proposed field bioassay with the tethered PVC containers. I can guarantee that you will kill fish with this approach, even the more robust silversides.. Unfortunately you wont know whether it was something related to a bioassay/contaminant effect or simply impingement of the juveniles by currents onto the screens. I suggest you dump this portion of the contaminant research because it will only generate problems for interpretation of your results. If you cant do it with the target species, whats the point?

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

Some form of this project needs to be done. Technically most of what they propose is feasible but it is also possible that a clear answer to all their hypotheses will not emerge.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

The proposers list products (publications) rather than performance measures under the performance measures section.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

There is little doubt that more knowledge of factors affecting delta smelt population dynamics is needed in order to understand how to proceed with protecting this species and what factors are contributing to its vulnerability. This project should provide such information but it may be too ambitious by tackling too many things all in one project without a good plan to eventually focus this group effort toward solvable barriers to smelt recruitment. A good example is the infestations with parasites. Parasites are the rule rather than the exception on wild fish and as fish age they also tend to become more infested. Of course stress could contribute to that but how can this be evaluated properly and more important what type of management action could

be taken to reduce effects of parasites? Probably none, so why focus on this? Why not focus on the more obvious choices that might be solvable with some form of management.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

This team has the background and expertise to conduct this research. As they point out in the proposal each has expertise in the section of this work they propose to cover and the model offers the hope of integrating the various findings into some sort of predictive capability.

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

They are asking for a lot of money for this project. Because it is a multi-investigator project and ambitious it will be expensive to conduct. The question of cost/benefit is a difficult one. It could turn out that although all the factors they will study contribute somewhat to less viable populations of smelt that the real problem is something they will not focus on in this study such as competition from exotic species or reduced estuarine productivity.

Miscellaneous comments:

External Scientific: #2

Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **204**

Applicant Organization: **University of California, Davis**

Proposal Title: **Integrated Assessment of Delta Smelt Condition Factors for Determining Contaminant and Food Web Effects on Population Dynamics**

Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

XCorrect

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

None

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Excellent: outstanding in all respects;

Good: quality but some deficiencies;

Poor: serious deficiencies.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	Important subject area, but somewhat narrow in approach to study factors responsible for population decline.
X Good	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

Although the concept is timely and important, the goals and hypotheses are broad and overstated for what is proposed.

Rating--good

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

Yes the study is justified and the underlying basis is well explained. This is especially true for the role of contaminants, although a different approach is needed. Other important factors are highlighted and included in the hypotheses, but do not have a large role in the experimental approach.

Rating--very good

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

This study is likely to add to the existing base of knowledge; however, a few key elements are missing. For example, the goal is to examine the impact of various factors, such as contaminants, temperature, food availability, parasitic infection, and water flow/entrainment, yet details are lacking on how most of these will be studied. Novel information, methodology and approaches may result from this study because of its multidisciplinary approach. It also has the potential to discover new interactions regarding the causes of reduced smelt populations. This work may be useful to decision makers if definitive results are obtained.

Rating--good

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

As stated before, some of the documentation is lacking, but what is proposed may be technically feasible. It is very possible that the factors responsible for the decline of delta smelt will not be ascertained in this study.

Rating--good

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

Yes, although quantification is not clear. This is not a restoration project.

Rating--very good

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

Peer-reviewed publications are likely from this study. If several of the hypotheses can be addressed and answered, then the products of this proposal will have value. Interpretive outcomes are possible if the hypotheses are adequately addressed.

Rating--very good

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

This is a solid group of researchers who have considerable experience with this area of study. The infrastructure does appear adequate.

Rating--very good

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

The allocation to histopathology and genotoxic responses, account for almost 1 million dollars over 3 years. These costs, accounting for 50% of the total budget, seem excessive.

Rating--good

Miscellaneous comments:

A complete copy of this proposal was not received from CalFed, even after repeated requests. Unfortunately, this document contained garbled text, no figures and missing appendices.

This is a very ambitious proposal to examining the impact of various factors, such as contaminants, temperature, food availability, parasitic infection, and water flow/entrainment on the delta smelt population dynamics. Several hypotheses were listed that included all of the above environmental variables. It really wasn't clear how many of these hypotheses would be tested. For example hypothesis 1d " Effects of food abundance are more important than effects of contaminants" or hypothesis 1e "effects of temperature are more important than parasitic infection and contaminants of reproductive output". Most of the experimental data collection appears to be focused on organic contaminant exposure, bioassays, histopathology, and biomarker evaluation. There was very little discussion about how data on temperature, food availability, parasitic infection, and water flow/entrainment would be acquired and how these factors would be related to reproductive and growth impairment. It appears the reproductive "output" will be assessed by the gonadal-somatic index (GSI) and histology. There was no mention of how these these measurements would be related to reproductive parameters or whether these assays alone would be sufficient to provide the information needed to determine reproductive success. Task 1, which will sample fish and assess growth by ageing otoliths, seems well thought out. Task 2 (organic contaminant exposure) is also fairly well designed to examine water concentrations of potential toxicants. This work is also appropriately designed around the temporal variability observed with many pesticides. Task 3 intends to examine acute lethal and sublethal bioassays to field water samples, although it is not clear what sublethal endpoints will be examined. This task also includes histopathological examination, which is presumably from lab and field fish. It was mentioned that histopathology would be used to distinguish contaminant effects from poor nutrition, which could be caused by many factors including, but not exclusively, reduced food availability. Task 4 is bioassay and biomarker development, which appears to be based exclusively on genetic damage. One of the pesticides (lambda cyhalothrin) was stated to be genotoxic, but there are several pesticides to be concerned with and many are likely not mutagenic. Using this limited array of bioindicators to assess sublethal effects due to pesticides exposure could be a serious limitation in this study.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 204

New Proposal Title: Integrated Assessment of Delta Smelt Condition Factors for Determining Contaminant and Food Web Effects on Population Dynamics

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

97-C06 Role of Contaminants in the Decline of Delta Smelt in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Final report for 97-C06 has been delayed due to the need for additional analysis and is expected within the next 4 weeks. This delay is not considered significant.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 204

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis

Proposal Title: Integrated Assessment of Delta Smelt Condition Factors for Determining Contaminant and Food Web Effects on Population Dynamics

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

Applicant has obtained all necessary permits. No environmental documentation needed.

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

Permits obtained so no further budget or timeline is needed.

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 204

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis

Proposal Title: Integrated Assessment of Delta Smelt Condition Factors for Determining Contaminant and Food Web Effects on Population Dynamics

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

\$2.00 difference!

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: